## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 19-38.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

In this regard, a new set of claims is presented wherein new claims 19 to 26 are based on previous claims 1 to 8, respectively.

New claim 27 defines the preferred functional groups of claim 26.

New claim 28 is based on previous claim 9.

New claim 29 recites the preferred functional groups of previous claim 9.

New claims 30 to 38 are based on previous claims 10 to 18, respectively.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1 to 18 as being indefinite in the term "obtainable", such term has been replaced by "obtained" i.e. in claim 19, line 3.

Accordingly, the rejection on indefiniteness is untenable.

With regard to the rejection of previous claims 2, 3 and 8 for reciting improper Markush groups, improper Markush terminology does not appear in the present claims.

With regard to the rejection of the term "(v) having or not remaining functional groups after the capping", such term does not appear in the present claims. In particular, see new claim 19.

Claims 1 to 18 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrisch et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Present claim 19 is directed to a composition comprising:

(A) a dispersion of a crosslinkable polyurethane polymer obtained in an oxygenated solvent having a higher boiling point of from 150 °C to 250 °, and

(B) a crosslinker which is a vinyl-type polymer having functional groups reactive with the functional groups of the polyurethane polymer (A).

Ingrisch et al. (U.S. 6,566,488) relates to a composition comprising a polyurethane polymer obtained from the reaction in stage (a) of compounds (A), (B), (C), (D) and (E),

followed by adding to this polyurethane, in stage (b), the monomer (F) and an initiator (G) and polymerizing the component (F) [see column 8, lines 30 to 56].

- The solvent (C) can be a high-boiling solvent or a low-boiling solvent (column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 4). Preference is given to N-methylpyrrolidone (column 6, lines 5 to 8).

- The monomer (F) is an acrylate or methacrylate. Preferred are combinations or methyl methacrylate, n-butyl acrylate and if desired styrene (column 7, lines 44 to 55).

Hence, the composition according to claim 19 differs from that of Ingrisch et al. by the use of an oxygenated high boiling solvent and by the use of vinyl-type polymers which have functional groups reactive with the functional groups of the urethane polymer.

- Although Ingrisch et al. lists different possible solvents encompassing those of present claim 19 as well as monomers which could react with the functional groups of the polyurethane, Ingrisch et al., clearly does not disclose such compositions. As can be seen from of the examples, N-methylpyrrolidone is always used as solvent for the preparation of the polyurethane.

- The monomer (F) being methyl methacrylate, n-butyl acrylate and if desired styrene (column 7, lines 44 to 55), the polymer obtained from the polymerization of these monomers does not contain functional groups reactive with the functional groups of the polyurethane (A).

Hence Ingrisch et al. does not disclose or suggest the compositions of present claim 19 wherein a vinyl-type polymer having functional groups reactive with the functional groups of the polyurethane polymer (A) is used.

Claim 19 and all claims depending or referring thereto are therefore novel and unobvious in view of Ingrisch et al.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Michel TIELEMANS et al.

By: _____

Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/akl
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 1, 2006